

Last year

The comment of a columnist in a daily newspaper, that I read approximately one year ago, in the end of 2014, was very intriguing. The columnist was referring to the fact that we were being unfair to the passing year by describing it as "old", and said that when the calendars hit December 31st, we needed to thank the year which was about to end due to the positive contributions it had made in our lives rather than celebrating the coming year that is yet to reveal its face. Therefore, I have decided to do exactly the same when we are about to start the new volume, in other words, the new year of the Anatolian Journal of Cardiology.

Since I prepared this editorial before the end of December, I will carry out my evaluation for eleven months. First, how did we work? Considering the fact that your applications determine the level of our work, a more appropriate question would be as such: how were we pushed to work? More than seven hundred new papers were sent to our journal during the eleven-month period. Four hundred and nine of these papers constituted original articles. When we consider the working days and calculate the monthly average of new articles sent to our office as thirty-seven, it will be easy to understand that editorial office put at least two new applications into process every day. The months when original articles were sent the most and the least were February with forty-nine and September with twenty-four researches. The most reasonable explanation for having received twice as less original articles in September when compared to February would be the long holiday we had during the religious feast.

We have upset you one hundred and eight times in terms of original articles. You may question whether upsetting someone else is a condition to thank for the year 2015. You are right. However, please try to put yourselves in the editorial board's shoes. Then, you will appreciate the fact that not every article can be accepted. It seems that we need to thank the year 2015 since our low rate of rejection results in pleased researchers rather than sad ones. However, an important point to remember is that since the scientific quality of our journal increases day by day, there will inevitably be a rise in the rate of rejections. In all the new applications, the second most sent papers are case studies and the rejection-acceptance rate is similar to that of the original articles. Sixty-six case studies have been accepted for publishing.

Can happiness arise from sorrow? In the personal communications with our colleagues who have sent their papers to our journal, we realised that there was a complaint regarding the fact that they receive or have received responses late. This makes us very upset. I think that we need to specify what late means since the concept of lateness involves relativity. If our colleagues believe that they receive responses later than expected, then this is a very subjective remark. There is advantage in making a more objective comparison when deciding on the lateness of the responses. The best way to do this is to compare the elapsed time between the date of application and

acceptance of our journal with that of the others. Thus, we have made a comparison. Please do not think that we see ourselves on an equal level with the journals I will give as examples. Three widely known and read cardiology journals have been chosen to make a comparison in terms of their evaluation periods. We have looked at the original articles published in each three journals in their last three issues. The average time elapsed between application and acceptance in Circulation is 152.5 days, 80.7 days in the Journal of American College of Cardiology, and 95.5 days in the International Journal of Cardiology. For the original articles published in the last two issues of our journal, the time elapsed between application and acceptance was 141.7 days. Receiving responses in a late manner from the authors and not taking responses even though at least eight reviewers are chosen can be given as reasons for this long period of time. As a result of the research we have conducted because of the complaints from our colleagues, we gladly thank the year 2015 since we are not in a bad situation. Besides, we can conclude from our research that our colleagues are unfair in complaining.

We have rewarded the best original article award twice this year. The first of these awards were distributed in the Istanbul meeting of the Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions in April 2015 in consequence to the result of the evaluation of the researches published in 2013. With the unconditional support of ETI Corporate Group, the 2014 awards, for the top three researches, were given to their researchers in October in the opening ceremony of the National Cardiology Congress in Antalya. While acknowledging 2015 for having enabled us to give this award that motivates young researchers twice this juries, we are conscious of the necessity to thank Firuz Kanatlı, the supplier of our award. We must not forget to thank the members of the juries that carried out the quite troublesome task of evaluation without any complaints and with care.

We saved the most important acknowledgement to the last. 2015 has brought a significant increase in our impact factor (IF). When the last three years are considered, an IF of 0.715 in 2012 and of 0.755 in 2013 has increased to 0.927 in an evaluation made in the summer of 2015. This is both pleasing and worrisome. Now that we are so close to "1" which can be seen as a psychological threshold, it would be regarded a failure if we cannot surpass it.

Let me end the first editorial of the new year, which I reserved for acknowledgements, with wishes. On behalf of our Editor-in Chief and editorial board, we wish you all good health. Yet, we would like to end the editorial by emphasizing that we are looking for researches, whose scientific quality is rapidly rising, in the year 2016.

Zeki Öngen
Editor
Istanbul-Turkey

